

T H E
C O N S E Q U E N C E
P R O V E D.



L O N D O N :
Printed in the Year MDCCLXXI.

CONSEQUENCE

BOOK OF

LONDON:

Printed in the Year MDCCLXXI.



T H E
C O N S E Q U E N C E
P R O V E D.

1. **M**R *Toplady*, a young, bold Man, lately published a Pamphlet, an Extract from which was soon after printed, concluding with these Words:

“ The Sum of all is this; One in twenty (suppose) of Mankind are *elected*: Nineteen in twenty are *reprobated*. The *Elect* shall be saved, do what they will: The *Reprobate* shall be damned, do what they can.”

2. A great Outcry has been raised on that Account, as though this was not a fair State of the Case: And it has been vehemently affirmed, that no such Consequence

quence follows from the Doctrine of absolute Predestination.

I calmly affirm, It is a fair State of the Case : This Consequence does naturally and necessarily follow from the Doctrine of absolute Predestination, as here stated and defended by bold Mr *Augustus Toplady*.

Indeed I have not leisure to consider the matter at large. I can only make a few Strictures, and leave the young Man to be farther corrected by (one that is full his Match) Mr *Thomas Olivers*.

3. " When Love is predicated of God, it implies,
" 1. His everlasting Will, Purpose, and Determina-
" tion, to save his People.* " I appeal to all Men,
Whether it is not a natural Consequence even of this,
That " all these shall be saved, do what they will."

You may say, " O, but they will do only what is
" good." Be it so. Yet the Consequence stands.

" *Election* signifies, That *sovereign, unconditional,*
" *immutable* Act of God, whereby he *selected* some to
" be eternally saved." *Immutable, Unconditional!*
From hence then it undeniably follows, " These shall
" be saved, do what they will."

" Predestination, as relating to the Elect, is that
" *irreversible* Act of the Divine Will, whereby God
" determined to deliver a *certain number* of Men from
" Hell."

* Mr T.'s Tract, Chap. 1.

"Hell." *Ergo*, That *certain number*, shall infallibly be saved, do what they will. Who can deny the Consequence?

"Not one of the Elect can perish, but they must all necessarily be saved.*" Can any assert this, and yet deny that Consequence, Therefore all the Elect shall be saved, do what they will? Unless you would say, It is the Proposition itself, rather than a Consequence from it.

4. So much for the former Part of the Question: Let us now consider the latter.

"Hatred ascribed to God, implies, a Resolution not to have Mercy on *such and such* Men. So *Esau* have I hated; that is, I did from all Eternity determine, not to have Mercy on him †." In other Words;

I by my dire Decree did seal
His fixt, unalterable Doom;
Consign'd his unborn Soul to Hell,
And damn'd him from his Mother's Womb.

Well then, does it not follow by unavoidable Consequence, that *such and such* Men, poor, hated *Esau* in particular, "shall be damned, do what they can?"

"Reprobation denotes God's eternal Preterition of some Men, and his Predestination of them to De-

A 3

"struction."

* Chap. 3.

† Chap. 1.

“struction.” And is it possible for them, by any thing they can do, to prevent that Destruction? You say, No. It follows, they “shall be damned, do what they can.”

“Predestination, as it regards the Reprobate, is that immutable Act of God’s Will, whereby he hath determined to *leave some Men* to perish.” And can they avoid it, by any thing they do? You affirm, they cannot. Again therefore it follows, these “shall be damned, do what they can.”

“We assert, There is a Predestination of *particular Persons* to Death: Which Death they shall inevitably undergo.” That is, “They shall be damned, do what they can.”

“The *Non-elect* were predestinated to eternal Death*.” *Ergo*, “They shall be damned, do what they can.”

“The Condemnation of the Reprobate is necessary and inevitable.” Surely I need add no more on this head. You see, That “the Reprobate shall be damned, do what they can,” is the whole Burden of the Song.

5. Take only two precious Sentences more, which include the whole Question.

“We assert, that the Number of the *Elect* †, and also

* Chap. 2.

† Chap. 4.

“ also of the *Reprobate*, is so *fixt* and *determinate*, that
 “ neither can be *augmented* or *diminished* :” And,

“ That the Decrees of Election and Reprobation
 “ are *immutable* and *irreversible*.”

From each of these Assertions, the whole Consequence follows, clear as the Noon-day Sun. Therefore, “ The Elect shall be saved, do what they will : The Reprobate shall be damned, do what they can.”

6. I add a Word, with regard to another Branch of this kind, charitable Doctrine.

Mr *Toplady* says *, “ God has a *positive* Will to destroy the Reprobate for their Sins.” *For their Sins !* How can that be ? I positively assert, That (on this Scheme) they have no Sins at all. They never had : They can have none. For it cannot be a Sin in a Spark to rise, or in a Stone to fall. And the Spark or the Stone is not more necessarily determined either to rise or to fall, than the Man is to sin, to commit that Rape; or Adultery, or Murder. For “ God did before all time, determine and direct to some particular End, every
 “ Person or Thing, to which he has given, or is yet
 “ to give Being.” God himself did “ predestinate
 “ them to fill up the Measure of their Iniquities :” Such was his sovereign, irresistible Decree, before the Foundation of the World. *To fill up the Measure of their Iniquities*, that is, to commit every Fact which they committed.

* Chap. 1.

† Chap. 4.

committed. So " God † decreed the Jews to be the
 " Crucifiers of Christ, and *Judas* to betray him."
 Whose fault was it then? You plainly say, It was not
his fault, but God's. For what was *Judas*, or ten
 thousand Reprobates besides? Could they resist his
 Decree? No more than they could pull the Sun out of
 the Firmament of Heaven. And would God punish
 them with everlasting Destruction, for not pulling the
 Sun out of the Firmament? He might as well do it
 for this, as for their not doing what (on this Supposi-
 tion) was equally impossible. " But they are punished
 " for their Impenitency, Sin, and Unbelief." Say
 Unbelief and Impenitency; but not Sin. For " God
 " had predestinated them to continue in Impenitency
 " and Unbelief. God had positively ordained them
 " to continue in their Blindness and Hardness of Heart."
 Therefore their not repenting and believing was no
 more a Sin, than their not pulling the Sun from Hea-
 ven.

7. Indeed Mr *T.* himself owns, " The Sins of the
 " Reprobate were not the Cause of their being *pass by*;
 " but merely and intirely the sovereign Will and de-
 " terminating Pleasure of God."

" O, but their Sin was the Cause of their *Damna-*
 " *tion*, though not of their *Preterition*:" That is, God
 determined they should live and die in their Sins, that
 he might afterwards damn them!

Was

Was ever any Thing like this? Yes, I have read something like it. When *Tiberius* had determined to destroy *Sejanus* and all his Family, as it was unlawful to put a Virgin to death, what could be done with his Daughter, a Child of nine Years old? Why, the Hangman was ordered first to *defflower*, and then to *strangle* her! Yet even good *Tiberius* did not order her to be strangled, “ *Because* she had been defflowered!” If so, it had been a parallel Case: It had been just what is here affirmed of the most High.

8. One Word more. “ I will obviate, says Mr T. “ a fallacious Objection, How is *Reprobation* reconcileable with the Doctrine of a future Judgment? “ There needs no Pains to reconcile these two.” No Pains! Indeed there does: More Pains than all the Men upon Earth, or all the Devils in Hell will ever be able to take. But go on. “ In the last Day, Christ “ will pass Sentence on the Non-elect, 1. Not for “ having done what they could not help, but, 2. For “ their *wilful Ignorance* of divine Things, 3. For “ their *obstinate Unbelief*, 4. For their *Omissions* of *Moral Duty*, and, 5. For their *repeated Iniquities* and “ *Transgressions*.”

He will condemn them, 1. “ Not for having done “ what they could not help.” I say, Yes; for having sinned against God to their Lives end. But this they could not help. He had himself decreed it. He had determined, they should continue impenitent. 2. “ For their “ *wilful*

“*wilful Ignorance* of divine Things.” No. Their Ignorance of God and the Things of God, was not wilful, was not originally owing to their own Will, but to the sovereign Will of God. *His* Will, not theirs, was the *primary Cause* of their continuing in that Ignorance. 3. “For their *obstinate Unbelief*.” No: How can it be termed obstinate, when they never had a Possibility of removing it? When God had absolutely decreed, before they were born, that they should live and die therein? 4. “For their *Omissions of Moral Duty* :” That is, for not loving God and their Neighbour, which is the Sum of the Moral Law. Was it then ever in their Power to love God and their Neighbour? No; no more than to touch Heaven with their Hand. Had not God himself unalterably decreed, That they should not love either God or Man? If therefore they are condemned for this, they are condemned for what they never could help. 5. “For their repeated *Iniquities and Transgressions*.” And was it ever in their Power to help these? Were they not predestinated thereto before the Foundation of the World? How then can the Judge of all the Earth consign them to everlasting Fire, for what was, in effect, his own Act and Deed?

I apprehend then this is no fallacious Objection; but a solid and weighty one: And defy any Man living, who asserts the unconditional Decree of Reprobation.

[II]

bation or Preterition (just the same in Effect) to reconcile this with the scriptural Doctrine of a future Judgment. I say again, I defy any Man on Earth to shew, How, on this Scheme, God can judge the *World in Righteousness.*

F I N I S.



tion or Tradition (as the same in H.C. 10 10)
 receive this with the original Doctrine of a future
 Judgment. I say again, I do not mean on Earth
 to know how on the contrary, God can judge us
 in the next life.

21113

2000
 2000
 2000
 2000